



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/975,985	10/15/2001	Kim B. Roberts	9-13528-152us	9596
7590	05/23/2007		EXAMINER	
Ogilvy Renault Suite 1600 1981 McGill College Avenue Montreal, QC H3A 2Y3 CANADA			CURS, NATHAN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2613	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/975,985

Applicant(s)

ROBERTS ET AL.

Examiner

Nathan Curs

Art Unit

2613

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 08 May 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: 6, 7, 15, 16, 18, 29, 35, 36 and 38.

Claim(s) rejected: 1, 3-5, 8-14, 17, 19-24, 26-28, 30-34 and 37.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
 13. Other: _____.


JASON CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance: First, the applicant argues against the objection to fig. 2 that requires it to be designated as prior art. Second, the applicant argues that the rejections under 35 USC § 103 rely entirely on the contention that Fig. 2 illustrates "only that which is old". At least, the applicant's second argument is not persuasive, because the rejections do not rely on the contention that fig. 2 shows only that which is old. Even assuming that the fig. 2 isn't entirely old, but shows both something old and something novel, the rejections rely on the part of fig. 2 that is admitted to as old (admitted to for fig. 2 in specification paragraph 0036; later admitted to for fig. 2, element 18 in the response of 1 December 2006). The applicant further argues, "it is axiomatic that the teaching of the present invention cannot be properly used as a basis for rejecting the claims of the present invention, as the Examiner now doing". This is not persuasive, because either the applicant's conclusion isn't axiomatic after all, or the Examiner is not doing what's alleged. It all depends on what the applicant means by "the teaching of the present invention". The applicant discloses some things and admits they are old. Does the applicant include these old things under the banner of "the teaching of the present invention"? If so, then the applicant's argument is not axiomatic after all. Or, does the applicant exclude these old things from the banner of "the teaching of the present invention"? If so, then the rejections are not based on the "teaching of the present invention" anyway. Regardless of what the applicant includes under the banner of "the teaching of the present invention", the rejections are based on what the applicant admits to as old.



JASON CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600